

REMARKS

In response to the office action of 30 January 2007, Applicant has included the corrected section of the amendment in the Amendment to the Claims section. Claims 1-5 have now been cancelled and newly added claims 6-10 have been marked with the expression “New.” Claims 6-10 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been entered.

In the October 10, 2006 office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled and claims 6-10 have been added to further distinguish from the prior art. As such, reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. 37 CFR §1.83 also states “[h]owever, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box). Since applicant's specification contains an adequate written description so as to enable one skilled in the art to understand as well as make and use the embodiments of the claimed subject matter, applicant has complied with the requirements of 37 CFR §1.83(a). Reconsideration of this requirement is also requested.

Next, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by an article found in the prior art entitled “Merry Cookies; sample the latest batch of winning recipes in CNY's annual holiday contest.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's characterization of the prior art as the statement of wrapping six cookies with plastic and tying

them with a ribbon and affixing a card would not enable someone to make and use the inventive subject matter as claimed.

Lastly, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by an article in the prior art entitled “The Bear Basics of Gift Wrapping.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's characterization of this prior art. Here, the elements of a bear wrapped with wrap in a bag and tied with a ribbon with a cookie cutter and ornament would not enable someone to make and use the claimed subject matter.

Applicants believe they have responded to all of the concerns raised by the Examiner and reconsideration is respectfully requested. If Examiner has any questions about the present response, a telephone interview is requested. No additional fees are due.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROL ELISE PAWLAK.

/MichaePEddyPTO#42505/

Dated: March 1, 2007

By: MICHAEL P. EDDY
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,505

LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL P. EDDY
12526 High Bluff Drive, Ste. 300
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 345-1098
Facsimile: (858) 777-5453